Project Progress Report

Project Name:	**Grants, Contracts, and Loans Management System**

Reporting Period:	From:	May 1, 2008	To:	May 31, 2008

Audience: Sadie Rodriquez-Hawkins, Jan Marie Ferrell, Polly Zehm, Allen Schmidt, Lynne McGuire, DIS, and ISB

Schedule Status: **[X] GREEN   [ ] YELLOW   [ ] RED**
(Green = project is on-time; Yellow = project is 10% behind schedule; Red = project is more than 10% behind schedule or a significant risk has arisen that could cause failure of the project)

Budget Status: **[X] GREEN   [ ] YELLOW   [ ] RED**
(Green = project is on-budget; Yellow = project is 10% over budget; Red = project is more than 10% over budget or a significant risk has arisen that could cause failure of the project)

Risk Status: **[X] GREEN   [ ] YELLOW   [ ] RED**
(Green = no new risks; Yellow = new risks are level 6 or less; Red = new risks are level 9)

Achievements

- Completed functional design sessions for: Create/Publish, Find, Apply, Screen/Evaluate, Award/Reject, Negotiate/Conditions, Agreement (Grant & Contract), Amend Agreement, Order/Master Contracts, Monitor Agreement Compliance, Monitor Agreement Progress (Progress Reports, Site Visits, Long Term Monitoring, Outcomes), Closeout Agreement, Fund Pool, Request Payment, Process Payment, Financial Adjustments/ Reconciliation, Batch Transactions, and Provider Registration with staff from the Departments of Ecology, Community, Trade, and Economic Development, Information Services, General Administration, and Social and Health Services.

- Signed Service Level Agreements for Geographic Information Systems services with the Departments of Ecology and Health.

- ISB approved the release of $2.1M through January 2009. At which point we will return to request the release of the remaining balance. The board was interested in how we are communicating with other agencies and the estimated cost for rolling out statewide in the next biennium.

- Met with the GCLM Executive Steering Committee to discuss issues with Commodity/Service codes, Geographic Information Systems, Performance Measurement, and Digital Signature/Electronic Authentication. Issues addressed: Commodity/Service codes (15170): Implementing NIGP – Closed; Geographic Information Systems (15175): System will not automatically calculate spatial boundary costs – Closed; Performance Measurement (15179, 15180, 15181): Utilize Performance Measure Tracking system data – Closed; Digital Signature/Electronic Authentication (15214, 15215, 15216) Use of. Get ruling from ATG and SAO.

Objectives for the next reporting period

- Implement the National Institute for Governmental Procurement (NIGP) commodity/service code structure.

- Complete design specifications and prototypes for Progress Reports, Apply, Provider Registration, Fiscal, and Create/Publish

- Review testing scope and ambiguities

- Complete mapping requirements to process and process to requirements

- Complete document matrix including workflow and business rules

- Complete document list including data elements

- Complete requirements for interfaces and message bus.

Schedule

Major Milestones and Deliverables for May

- Complete a portion of the technical specifications and testing scope.

Planned Major Milestones and Deliverables

- Pilot
  - **Pilot configuration requirements and design**   **7/31**
    - Configure System   11/3
    - System Testing   11/19
      - Test Scripts
      - Testing Framework
      - Completed System Test
  - **User Acceptance Testing**   **12/10**
  - **Re-baseline – Go/No-Go**   **12/10**
- **ECY – CTED first program implementation**   **1/12**
- Rollout to remaining programs   6/24
- Post implementation review   7/2

Budget

IT Project Pool:	**5,463,810**
Project-to-date (7/07 to 5/08)	
* Expense transactions recorded as of June 09	
Salaries/Benefits	411,957
Internal Administrative	188,486
Software Package	260,000
External QA	25,215
External Testing	32,525
Equipment	2,887
Travel	1,938
Goods & Services:	2,577
Total Expense:	**925,585**
Project Balance:	**4,538,225**

Issues

16711 – What process will be used for legal approval of enterprise agreement terms?

Summary: GCLM offers the opportunity to reduce contracting risks by requiring the use of standard agreement terms, where appropriate. Examples of potential standard terms:

- Agreement termination process (with a variable for the number of days for required notice)

- Requirement to request payment for services electronically, through GCLM

> unless a waiver has been granted.
>
> - Requirements for work to start after filing, for personal service contracts.
>
> - Requirements for compliance with general federal regulations and single audit reporting for federal grant assistance.
>
> **Problem:** Smaller agencies are often able to use standard agreement templates. For larger agencies, proposed agreement language is reviewed by the agency's assigned Assistant Attorney General (AAG). After great effort, CTED, Ecology, and DSHS have each managed to gain their AAGs' approvals of some standard agreement templates for use by their agencies. Each AAG's decisions apply only to their assigned agencies. These larger agencies also often have constituent groups that influence how agreement terms are worded. The result can be slight variations or even completely opposite AAG opinions on the same issue for different agencies. When contracting legal issues arise for GCLM, which AAG will decide what the legal opinion is?

Risks

Newly discovered or re-arisen, including Risk Severity Indicator